



[7590-01-P]

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2015-0240]

**Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses
Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Considerations and Containing Sensitive
Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information and Order Imposing Procedures for Access to
Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information**

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: License amendment request; opportunity to comment, request a hearing, and petition for leave to intervene; order.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received and is considering approval of five amendment requests. The amendment requests are for Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3; Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2; Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2; Cooper Nuclear Station; and Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1. The NRC proposes to determine that each amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, each amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).

DATES: Comments must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 30 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. A request for a hearing must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. Any potential party as defined in § 2.4 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR),

who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by **[INSERT DATE 10 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods (unless this document describes a different method for submitting comments on a specific subject):

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2015-0240**. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463; e-mail: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document.
- **Mail comments to:** Cindy Bladey, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see “Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments” in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lynn Ronewicz, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1927, e-mail: Lynn.Ronewicz@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID **NRC-2015-0240** when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2015-0240**.

- **NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):**
You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "[ADAMS Public Documents](#)" and then select "[Begin Web-based ADAMS Search](#)." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section.

- **NRC's PDR:** You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

B. Submitting Comments.

Please include Docket ID **NRC-2015-0240**, facility name, unit number(s), application date, and subject in your comment submission.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC posts all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as entering the comment submissions into

ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

I. Background

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the NRC is publishing this notice. The Act requires the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

II. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish a notice of issuance in the *Federal Register*. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

A. Opportunity to Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave to Intervene

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC's regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: (1) the name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also set

forth the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that person's admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present evidence and to submit a cross-examination plan for cross-examination of witnesses, consistent with NRC regulations, policies, and procedures.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(iii).

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions for leave to intervene set forth in this section, except that under § 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or Federally-recognized Indian tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian tribe, or agency thereof may also have the opportunity to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who does not wish, or is not qualified, to become a party to the proceeding may, in the discretion of the presiding officer, be permitted to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.315(a). A person making a limited

appearance may make an oral or written statement of position on the issues, but may not otherwise participate in the proceeding. A limited appearance may be made at any session of the hearing or at any prehearing conference, subject to the limits and conditions as may be imposed by the presiding officer. Persons desiring to make a limited appearance are requested to inform the Secretary of the Commission by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**.

B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an

electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in the NRC's "Guidance for Electronic Submission," which is available on the agency's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web site, but should note that the NRC's E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with NRC guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides

access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail to MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding

officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. However, in some instances, a request to intervene will require including information on local residence in order to demonstrate a proximity assertion of interest in the proceeding. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

For further details with respect to these license amendment applications, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR. For additional direction on obtaining information related to this document, see the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments," section of this document.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC (EGC), Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station (DNPS), Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois; and Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station (QCNPS), Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: February 6, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated September 1, 2015. Publicly-available versions are available in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML15055A154 and ML15251A381, respectively.

Description of amendment request: **This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).** The amendment would revise Technical

Specification (TS) 5.6.5, "Core Operating Limits Report (COLR)," to delete no longer used methodologies and to add the AREVA analysis methodologies to the list of approved methods to be used in determining the core operating limits in the COLR. Exelon Generation Company, LLC, also proposes to revise DNPS and QCNPS TS 3.2.3, "Linear Heat Generation Rate (LHGR)," and TS 3.7.7, "The Main Turbine Bypass System." In addition, the proposed amendment would change one of the Allowable Values in the DNPS and QCNPS TS Surveillance Requirement 3.3.4.1.4, "ATWS-RPT [Anticipated Transient Without Scram Recirculation Pump Trip] Instrumentation."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change has no effect on any accident initiator or precursor previously evaluated and does not change the manner in which the core is operated. The type of fuel is not a precursor to any accident. The new methodologies for determining core operating limits have been validated to ensure that the output accurately models predicted core behavior, and use of the methodologies will be within the ranges previously approved. The new methodologies being referenced have all been submitted to the NRC, and have been approved.

The proposed changes to the TS associated with LHGR and the Main Turbine Bypass System, support the new analyses performed as part of the transition to ATRIUM 10XM fuel. These changes do not require modification to the plant and do not impact any initiators of an accident previously analyzed. Implementation of these changes will ensure that the basis for the accident and transient analyses are maintained throughout the operating cycle.

The proposed change to the ATWS-RPT high RPV [reactor pressure vessel] steam dome pressure does not require modification to the facility beyond the conservative reduction of the allowable value (AV). The proposed change will be implemented through revision of the associated

surveillance test procedures, where the revised AV will replace the existing value.

Calculation of the AV to plant-specific parameters provides additional confidence that protective instrumentation that passes the surveillance testing criteria will perform its design function without exceeding the associated limit.

The revised AV for the ATWS-RPT is not considered an initiator to any previously analyzed accident and therefore, cannot increase the probability of any previously evaluated accident. Implementation of the revised AV will ensure that the instrumentation will perform its required function to meet the accident analysis assumptions. The proposed AV will ensure that the fuel is adequately cooled and over pressurization of the nuclear steam supply system is prevented following an accident or transient. The proposed change does not increase the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

There is no change in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change in the administratively controlled analytical methods does not affect the ability to successfully respond to previously evaluated accidents and does not affect radiological assumptions used in the evaluations. The source term from ATRIUM 10XM fuel will be bounded by the source term assumed in the accident analyses. Since the proposed change ensures the same level of protection as assumed in the accident analyses, the conclusions of the accident scenarios remain valid. As a result, no changes to radiological release parameters are involved. There is no effect on the type or amount of radiation released, and there is no effect on predicted offsite doses in the event of an accident.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change does not affect the performance of any DNPS or QCNPS structure, system, or component credited with mitigating any accident previously evaluated. The use of new analytical methods, which have been reviewed and approved by the NRC, for the design of a core reload will not affect the control parameters governing unit operation or the response of plant equipment to transient conditions. The proposed change does not introduce any new modes of system operation or failure mechanisms. The proposed TS changes ensure operation in compliance with the accident and transient analyses.

The proposed change to the ATWS-RPT AV does not involve any physical changes to the ATWS-RPT system or associated components beyond the reduction in the ATWSRPT AV for high reactor vessel steam dome pressure, or the manner in which the ATWS-RPT system functions. The proposed change will not alter the manner in which equipment operation is initiated nor will the functional demands on credited equipment be changed. The change in methods governing normal plant operation is consistent with the current ATWS analysis assumptions specified in the DNPS and QCNPS Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR).

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change to TS 3.2.3 provides assurance the operating parameters are consistent with the inputs to the transient analyses which take credit for conservatism in scram speed performance. The proposed change does not alter the acceptance criteria for control rod scram times. The proposed revision to TS 3.7.7 allows the flexibility to take credit for LHGR limits defined in the COLR based on the analyses supporting the transition to ATRIUM 10XM fuel. The proposed change to TS Section 5.6.5.b adds new analytical methods for design and analysis of core reloads to the list of methods currently used to determine the core operating limits. The NRC has previously approved the analytical methods being added.

The proposed change also lowers the ATWS-RPT AV for RPT on high reactor steam dome pressure. There is no decrease in the margin of safety, since the maximum reactor vessel pressure for a postulated ATWS event and ASME overpressure event is maintained below the acceptance criteria. The proposed change will be implemented through revisions to the associated surveillance test procedures where the revised AV replaces the existing AV. Since the availability of the ATWS-RPT system will be maintained and since the system design is unaffected, the proposed change ensures the instrumentation is capable of performing its intended function.

Since the setpoint at which the ATWS-RPT is activated is not a safety limit, the proposed change does not modify any safety limits at which protective actions are initiated, and does not change the requirements governing operation or availability of safety equipment assumed to operate to preserve the margin of safety.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based upon the above, EGC concludes that the proposed amendment presents no significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), and, accordingly, a finding of no significant hazards consideration is justified.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Tamra (Tami) Domeyer, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, Illinois 60555.

NRC Branch Chief: Travis L. Tate.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (NMP2), Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: September 3, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15252A204.

Description of amendment request: **This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).** The amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 2.1.1 ("Reactor Core SLs"). Specifically, this change incorporates revised Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratios (SLMCPRs) due to the cycle specific analysis performed by Global Nuclear Fuel (GNF) for the introduction of GNF2 fuel for NMP2, Cycle 16.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The derivation of the cycle specific Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratios (SLMCPRs) for incorporation into the Technical Specifications (TS), and their use to determine cycle specific thermal limits, has been performed using the methodology discussed in NEDE-24011-P-A, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel," Revision 21.

The basis of the SLMCPR calculation is to ensure that during normal operation and during abnormal operational transients, at least 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core do not experience transition boiling if the limit is not violated. The new SLMCPRs preserve the existing margin to transition boiling.

The Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) safety limit is reevaluated for each reload using NRC-approved methodologies. The analyses for NMP2, Cycle 16, have concluded that a two recirculation loop MCPR safety limit of \geq [greater than or equal to] 1.15, based on the application of Global Nuclear Fuel's NRC-approved MCPR safety limit methodology, will ensure that this acceptance criterion is met. For single recirculation loop operation, a MCPR safety limit of \geq 1.15 also ensures that this acceptance criterion is met. The MCPR operating limits are presented and controlled in accordance with the NMP2 Core Operating Limits Report (COLR).

The requested TS changes do not involve any plant modifications or operational changes that could affect system reliability or performance or that could affect the probability of operator error. The requested changes do not affect any postulated accident precursors, do not affect any accident mitigating systems, and do not introduce any new accident initiation mechanisms.

Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The SLMCPR is a TS numerical value, calculated to ensure that during normal operation and during abnormal operational transients, at least 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core do not experience transition boiling if the limit is not violated. The new SLMCPRs are calculated using NRC-approved methodology discussed in NEDE-24011-P-A, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel," Revision 21. The proposed

changes do not involve any new modes of operation, any changes to setpoints, or any plant modifications. The proposed revised MCPR safety limits have been shown to be acceptable for Cycle 16 operation. The core operating limits will continue to be developed using NRC-approved methods. The proposed MCPR safety limits or methods for establishing the core operating limits do not result in the creation of any new precursors to an accident.

Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

There is no significant reduction in the margin of safety previously approved by the NRC as a result of the proposed change to the SLMCPRs. The new SLMCPRs are calculated using methodology discussed in NEDE-24011-P-A, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel," Revision 21. The SLMCPRs ensure that during normal operation and during abnormal operational transients, at least 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core do not experience transition boiling if the limit is not violated, thereby preserving the fuel cladding integrity.

Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety previously approved by the NRC.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: J. Bradley Fewell, Senior Vice President, Regulatory Affairs, Nuclear, and General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, Illinois 60555.

NRC Branch Chief: Benjamin G. Beasley.

Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50-298, Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS), Nemaha County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: August 6, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under package Accession No. ML15229A031.

Description of amendment request: **This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).** The proposed amendment would revise the CNS Technical Specifications (TS) by relocating pressure and temperature (P/T) limit curves to a pressure and temperature limits report (PTLR). The proposed amendment would modify TS Section 3.4.9, "RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Pressure and Temperature (P/T) Limits," by replacing the existing reactor vessel heatup and cooldown rate limits and the P/T limit curves with references to the PTLR. A definition for the PTLR will be added to TS Section 1.1, "Definitions," and a section addressing administrative requirements for the PTLR will be added to TS Section 5.6, "Reporting Requirements." The existing CNS NRC-approved P/T limit curves for 32 effective full-power years are not being revised as a part of this relocation. In addition, editorial corrections are being made to the TS Table of Contents.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment revises the TS by replacing references to existing reactor vessel heatup and cooldown rate limits and P/T limit curves with references to the PTLR. In 10 CFR 50, Appendix G, requirements are established to protect the integrity of the reactor coolant pressure boundary (RCPB) in nuclear power plants.

Continued use of an Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-approved methodology for calculating P/T limit curves and relocating those curves to a PTLR provide an equivalent level of assurance that RCPB integrity will be maintained, as specified in 10 CFR 50, Appendix G.

The proposed amendment does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors, and does not alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the plant or the manner in which the plant is operated and maintained. The ability of structures, systems, and components to perform their intended safety functions is not altered or prevented by the proposed changes, and the assumptions used in determining the radiological consequences of previously evaluated accidents are not affected.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The relocation of P/T limits to the PTLR is administrative in nature and does not alter or involve any design basis accident initiators. RCPB integrity will continue to be maintained in accordance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix G, and the accident performance of plant structures, systems, and components will not be affected. These changes do not involve any physical alteration of the plant, and installed equipment is not being operated in a new or different manner. Thus, no new failure modes are introduced.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment is administrative in nature and does not affect the function of the RCPB or its response during plant transients. Continuing to calculate the P/T limits using NRC-approved methodology ensures adequate margins of safety relating to RCPB integrity are maintained. The proposed changes do not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined, there are no changes to set points at which protective actions are initiated, and the operability requirements for equipment assumed to operate for accident mitigation are not affected.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. John C. McClure, Nebraska Public Power District, Post Office Box 499, Columbus, Nebraska 68602-0499.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC), Docket No. 50-321, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant (HNP), Unit 1, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: September 1, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15252A186.

Description of amendment request: **This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).** The amendment would change the Technical Specification value of the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (SLMCPR) for both single and dual recirculation loop operation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration because:

1. The operation of HNP Unit 1 in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (SLMCPR) ensures that, 99.9% of the fuel rods in the core will not be susceptible to boiling transition during normal operation or the most limiting postulated design-basis transient event. The new SLMCPR values preserve the existing

margin to the onset of transition boiling; therefore, the probability of fuel damage is not increased as a result of this proposed change. The determination of the revised HNP Unit 1 SLMCPRs has been performed using NRC-approved methods of evaluation. These plant-specific calculations are performed each operating cycle and may require changes for future cycles. The revised SLMCPR values do not change the method of operating the plant; therefore, they have no effect on the probability of an accident initiating event or transient.

Based on the above, SNC has concluded that the proposed change will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The operation of HNP Unit 1 in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes result only from a specific analysis for the HNP Unit 1 core reload design. These changes do not involve any new or different methods for operating the facility. No new initiating events or transients result from these changes.

Based on the above, SNC has concluded that the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated.

3. The operation of HNP Unit 1 in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The new SLMCPRs have been calculated using NRC-approved methods of evaluation with plant and cycle-specific input values for the fuel and core design for the upcoming cycle of operation. The SLMCPR values ensure that 99.9% of the fuel rods in the core will not be susceptible to boiling transition during normal operation or the most limiting postulated design-basis transient event. The operating MCPR limit is set appropriately above the safety limit value to ensure adequate margin when the cycle-specific transients are evaluated. Accordingly, the margin of safety is maintained with the revised values.

As a result, SNC has determined that the proposed change will not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Jennifer M. Buettner, Associate General Counsel, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, 40 Inverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, Alabama 35201.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert Pascarelli.

**Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards
Information for Contention Preparation**

**Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear
Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois; and Docket Nos. 50-254 and
50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2,
Rock Island County, Illinois**

**Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,
Unit 2, Oswego County, New York**

**Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50-298, Cooper Nuclear Station,
Nemaha County, Nebraska**

**Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-321, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant,
Unit 1, Appling County, Georgia**

A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing SUNSI.

B. Within 10 days after publication of this notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, any potential party who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice may request such access. A “potential party” is any person who intends to participate as a party by demonstrating standing and filing an admissible contention under 10 CFR 2.309. Requests for access to SUNSI submitted later than 10 days after publication of this notice will not be considered absent a showing of good cause for the late filing, addressing why the request could not have been filed earlier.

C. The requester shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001,

Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The e-mail address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov and OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov, respectively.¹ The request must include the following information:

- (1) A description of the licensing action with a citation to this *Federal Register* notice;
- (2) The name and address of the potential party and a description of the potential party's particularized interest that could be harmed by the action identified in C.(1); and
- (3) The identity of the individual or entity requesting access to SUNSI and the requester's basis for the need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding. In particular, the request must explain why publicly-available versions of the information requested would not be sufficient to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention.

D. Based on an evaluation of the information submitted under paragraph C.(3) the NRC staff will determine within 10 days of receipt of the request whether:

- (1) There is a reasonable basis to believe the petitioner is likely to establish standing to participate in this NRC proceeding; and
- (2) The requestor has established a legitimate need for access to SUNSI.

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2) above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of the

¹ While a request for hearing or petition to intervene in this proceeding must comply with the filing requirements of the NRC's "E-Filing Rule," the initial request to access SUNSI under these procedures should be submitted as described in this paragraph.

requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order² setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after the requestor is granted access to that information. However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline. This provision does not extend the time for filing a request for a hearing and petition to intervene, which must comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.309.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

(1) If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff after a determination on standing and need for access, the NRC staff shall immediately notify the requestor in writing, briefly stating the reason or reasons for the denial.

(2) The requester may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination by filing a challenge within 5 days of receipt of that determination with: (a) the presiding officer designated in this proceeding; (b) if no presiding officer has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative judge, or an administrative law judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) officer if that officer has been designated to rule on information access issues.

² Any motion for Protective Order or draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit or Agreement for SUNSI must be filed with the presiding officer or the Chief Administrative Judge if the presiding officer has not yet been designated, within 30 days of the deadline for the receipt of the written access request.

H. Review of Grants of Access. A party other than the requester may challenge an NRC staff determination granting access to SUNSI whose release would harm that party's interest independent of the proceeding. Such a challenge must be filed with the Chief Administrative Judge within 5 days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of access.

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.³

I. The Commission expects that the NRC staff and presiding officers (and any other reviewing officers) will consider and resolve requests for access to SUNSI, and motions for protective orders, in a timely fashion in order to minimize any unnecessary delays in identifying those petitioners who have standing and who have propounded contentions meeting the specificity and basis requirements in 10 CFR part 2. Attachment 1 to this Order summarizes the general target schedule for processing and resolving requests under these procedures.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of October, 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,
Secretary of the Commission.

³ Requesters should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.

ATTACHMENT 1--General Target Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information in this Proceeding

Day	Event/Activity
0	Publication of <i>Federal Register</i> notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.
10	Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) demonstration of standing; and (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply).
20	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requester of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for petitioner/requester to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.

Day	Event/Activity
A	If access granted: issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60	Decision on contention admission.